

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

CORINE O'DELL,

Plaintiff,

v.

NATIONAL RECOVERY AGENCY,

Defendant.

:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:

CIVIL ACTION NO. 16-5211

**ORDER**

**AND NOW**, this 15th day of August, 2018, after considering the following: (1) the motion for clarification filed by the plaintiff (Doc. No. 92), (2) the declaration in response to the motion for clarification filed by the defendant (Doc. No. 93), and (3) the declaration in support of the motion for clarification filed by the plaintiff (Doc. No. 94); accordingly, it is hereby **ORDERED** that the motion for clarification is **DENIED**.<sup>1</sup>

BY THE COURT:



---

EDWARD G. SMITH, J.

---

<sup>1</sup> “The general purpose of a motion for clarification is to explain or clarify something ambiguous or vague . . . .” *Resolution Tr. Corp. v. KPMG Peat Marwick*, No. CIV. A. 92-1373, 1993 WL 211555, at \*2 (E.D. Pa. June 8, 1993). Because the court’s prior order (Doc. No. 75) was not ambiguous or vague, the court denies the motion.